DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 151 HE 001 020

By-Dispenzieri, Angelo; Kweller, Irving

A Survey of Community Agency Experience with the SEEK Program.

City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Research and Evaluation Unit for Special Programs.
Pub Date 5 Jun 69
Note-69p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.55
Descriptors-Agencies, *Community Agencies (Public), Community Cooperation, Community Support, *Educational Opportunities, *Higher Education, Poverty Programs, *School Community Relationship, Special Programs, *Urban Youth, Youth Programs
Identifiers-*SEEK

Offered by the City University of New York, SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge) is an educational opportunity program concerned with high school graduates from poverty-area neighborhoods who would not have been admitted to college on the basis of their grades, but who have potential for college in terms of basic ability. A distinguishing feature of SEEK is its close working relationship with community agencies which help to recruit students. The agencies are encouraged to stay in touch with accepted applicants and follow their progress in the program. Constant communication between the program and agencies is necessary to maintain interest and involvement. To gather information about the community agencies and their activities and experiences concerning the SEEK program, a questionnaire was mailed in February 1969 to approximately 1200 agencies. Questions were asked about a variety of areas, including the volume of referrals made and anticipated, community attitude toward SEEK, and satisfaction with SEEK among agencies, communities, and students. The results from the 30% that responded indicated that: while hundreds of agencies had referred applicants to SEEK, hundreds of others had not; referral activity was generally on a small scale (less than 10 per agency in most cases); and the great majority of agencies that made referrals were satisfied with the program and reported satisfaction on the part of their communities and students. (JS)

ED031151

A SURVEY OF COMMUNITY AGENCY EXPERIENCE WITH THE SEEK PROGRAM

by

ANGELO DISPENZIERI
Director of Research

and

IRVING KWELLER
Senior Research Associate

LEILA LONG
Research Associate

SEYMOUR GINIGER
Senior Research Associate

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

RESEARCH AND EVALUATION UNIT

LESLIE BERGER
Director of SEEK Program

RACHEL WILKINSON
Director of Community Relations
for SEEK Program

HE 001 020

JUNE 5, 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people besides the authors cooperated to make this survey possible. Chancellor Bowker has steadfastly supported our endeavors in attempting to evaluate highly innovative and complex programs such as SEEK. Vice Chancellor Hollander has consistently demonstrated his concern and support for our research. Dr. Leslie Berger, as Director of SEEK, readily accepted our suggestion for undertaking the present study. Dr. Rachel Wilkinson, Director of Community Relations for SEEK, gave generously of her extensive background and many insights concerning the relationship between SEEK and the community agencies, and provided the names and addresses of all the agencies that were contacted in the study. Without the hundreds of these agencies which responded -- in most cases with considerable thoughtfulness -- the survey would not have been possible at all. Finally, several members of the Research and Evaluation Unit, particularly Mr. Milton Heumann and Mrs. Darcy Greher, deserve special thanks for their roles in developing the study and in processing the data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	iv
SUMMARY	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	4
FINDINGS	5
A. Disposition of Sample	5
B. Referring vs. Non-Referring Agencies	8
C. Activities and Experiences of Referring Agencies	11
Year Agency Began Referring to SEEK	11
Volume of Referrals	11
Volume of Acceptances	13
Trends in Volume of Referrals 1966-68	17
Expected Volume of Referrals in 1969	19
Interest in College Among Potential Applicants	19
Initiation of Idea of Applying to SEEK	22
Number of Years Out of High School Among Applicants	22
Interest in SEEK According to Time Out of High School	24
Volume of Non-Referrals Because of Ineligibility	27

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	PAGE
D. Attitude Toward SEEK	30
Student Discussion With Agency about SEEK Experiences	30
Student Satisfaction with SEEK	32
Agency Satisfaction with SEEK	32
Agency Satisfaction and Student Satisfaction	35
Community Attitude Toward SEEK	35
Community Attitude and Student Satisfaction	37
Community Awareness of SEEK	37
Attitudes Reported by Non-Referring Agencies	41
E. Selected Characteristics of Agencies	42
Major Functions	42
Sources of Funding	44
Referrals to Other Programs	44
F. Recommended Changes for SEEK	49
APPENDIX A. Questionnaire	
APPENDIX B. Covering Letter	
APPENDIX C. Reminder Letter	
APPENDIX D. List of Other Educational Programs to Which Agencies Refer Students	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Number of Agencies Responding	6
2	Reasons for Not Completing the Questionnaire	7
3	Number of Agencies Referring to SEEK	9
4	Year Agency Began Making Referrals to SEEK	12
5	Number of Applicants Referred to SEEK by Year Agency Began Referring	14
6	Number of Applicants Accepted in SEEK	15
7	Acceptance Rate Per Agency	16
8	Volume of Referrals During 1968 Compared With Previous Years, by Year Agency Began Referring to SEEK	18
9	Expected Volume of Referrals During 1969 Compared with 1968.	20
10	Interest in Going to College Today Compared to a Few Years Ago	21
11	Initiation of Idea of Applying to SEEK	23
12	High School Graduation Status of 51% or More of Applicants Referred by Each Agency	25
13	Interest in Applying to SEEK among High School Seniors and Recent High School Graduates Compared to Graduates Who Have Been Out of School for Several Years	26

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

TABLE		PAGE
14	Potential Applicants Discouraged by Agencies from Applying Because of Ineligibility	28
15	Proportion of Students Referred by Agency Who Discussed Their Experiences With Agency	31
16	Student Satisfaction With SEEK	33
17	Agency Satisfaction With SEEK	34
18	Agency Satisfaction by Student Satisfaction With SEEK	36
19	Agency Perception of Community Attitude Toward SEEK	38
20	Community Attitude by Student Satisfaction With SEEK	39
21	Agency Perception of Community Awareness of SEEK	40
22	Major Function of Agency	43
23	Source of Agency Funds	45
24	Number of Other College Programs to Which Agencies Refer Students	46
25	Agency Referrals to Urban Centers and Skills or Technical Programs	48
26	Changes Suggested for SEEK Program	50

SUMMARY

Ever since the SEEK program began operation in 1966, hundreds of community agencies have worked with it in recruiting students and in fostering community involvement with the program. A questionnaire was mailed in February 1969 to approximately 1200 community agencies with which the SEEK Community Relations office has had contact. Its purpose was to ascertain the activities and experiences of these agencies with SEEK, and their own and their communities' feelings about the program.

The results, in brief, indicate that while hundreds of agencies have referred applicants to SEEK, hundreds of others have not; that referral activity to SEEK is generally on a small scale (less than 10 referrals per agency in most cases); and that the great majority of agencies which made referrals were satisfied with the program and reported that their communities and the students they referred were satisfied too.

Specific findings were as follows:

1. Out of 1175 agencies which received the questionnaire, 276 completed it, 77 phoned or wrote that they could not complete it (usually because of

lack of contact with the program) and 822 did not reply at all.

2. Two-thirds of the agencies which completed the questionnaire reported that they had referred applicants to SEEK at some time; the other one-third had not. It is not known whether these same proportions obtain among the 822 nonresponding agencies, but it is fairly certain that several hundred agencies have never referred anyone to the program.
3. For most referring agencies the number of referrals per agency was 10 or fewer, even though it ranged as high as 1200. For the majority of referring agencies, 10 or fewer of their referrals were accepted.
4. There was no clear trend in the volume of referrals per agency between 1966 and 1968, but six out of ten referring agencies expected to make more referrals in 1969 than in 1968.
5. Many agencies not only made referrals, but continued their involvement with the students they referred: three out of four referring agencies

reported that students subsequently returned to the agency and discussed their experience in SEEK.

6. The students referred by the agencies were satisfied with SEEK, according to the great majority (72%) of referring agencies. Only 11% of these agencies reported student dissatisfaction, the remainder reporting neutral feeling.

7. The great majority of referring agencies (71%) were themselves satisfied with SEEK and most others were neutral; very few were dissatisfied.

8. Two out of three referring agencies (64%) reported that their communities felt favorably toward SEEK and most others reported neutral attitudes; very few found unfavorable community feeling.

9. Most referring agencies (60%) reported a general community awareness of SEEK but the remainder -- a substantial proportion -- found a lack of awareness.

10. The overwhelming majority of both referring agencies (96%) and non-referring agencies (87%) reported a heightened interest in going to college among the type of students SEEK is trying to reach.

11. Nevertheless, the agencies discouraged many potential students from applying to SEEK because these applicants did not meet one or more of the program's eligibility requirements: nearly 1400 were discouraged because of previous college and more than 1100 because they were over 30 years old.
12. Most referring agencies reported that the majority of their referrals were high school seniors and recent graduates rather than people who had been out of high school for some time.
13. Among changes that were recommended for SEEK, one that was frequently suggested, especially by non-referring agencies, was for more communication of information about the program to agencies and communities. Also suggested was better feedback to agencies regarding eligibility and acceptance of referred students, and revision of certain eligibility criteria such as "no previous college," the 30-year age limit and residence in a poverty area.

INTRODUCTION

SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge) is an educational opportunity program offered by The City University of New York. High School graduates from poverty-area neighborhoods who would not have been admitted into college on the basis of their grades, but who have potential for college in terms of basic ability, are the special concern of the program.

A distinguishing feature of the SEEK Program is its close working relationship with community agencies. It was assumed from the beginning that the most effective way to reach potential students was through agencies in the community. During 1967-68 at least 1,250 community agencies were contacted about the program and proved to be very useful in the task of recruiting prospective SEEK students. One-third of the 539 new SEEK students who registered for the Fall 1967 semester were referred by community agencies; 92 agencies were involved. Of the 610 new students enrolled in SEEK for the Spring 1968 semester, 59% were referred by 235 community agencies.

There are many types of agencies involved, such as neighborhood centers providing a variety of services to communities, church and religious groups, the YMCA and YWCA, social service agencies, counseling agencies, and others. Some agencies deal with specialized groups of people - the elderly, pre-school, teen-agers - while others serve all ages within a community.

The SEEK policy of fostering the involvement of community agencies with the program is carried out by the Community Relations Program under the direction of Dr. Rachel Wilkinson. Orientation meetings are held with agency personnel to familiarize them with admission policies and procedures. Information is sent to the agencies concerning the eligibility, acceptance or rejection of applicants referred by the agencies. The agencies are encouraged to maintain contact with accepted applicants and to follow their progress in the program.

Since there is a high turnover of personnel in many agencies, as well as new agencies being created and others dissolving; constant communication between the SEEK Program and the agencies is necessary to maintain interest and involvement among agencies and communities.

The purpose of the current study was to gather information about the community agencies and their activities and experiences concerning the SEEK program. Questions were asked concerning a variety of areas, including the volume of referrals made in the past and expected in the future, community attitude toward SEEK, and satisfaction with SEEK among agencies, communities, and students.

METHOD

Questionnaires were mailed to 1,222 community agencies whose names and addresses were provided by Dr. Rachel Wilkinson, Director of Community Relations for SEEK. The questionnaire, accompanied by a letter explaining its purpose, was sent on February 4, 1969. "Reminder" letters were sent about three weeks later to agencies which had not responded. Questionnaires received after March 7 were excluded from the analysis. (A copy of the two letters and the questionnaire may be found in the Appendix).

The questionnaire consisted of 20 questions on agency activities and experiences with SEEK, plus additional questions on agency functions and funding. The first portion of the questionnaire was directed only to agencies which had referred applicants to SEEK, with questions about the volume of referrals and acceptances, the high school graduation status of applicants, the number of applicants the agency discouraged from applying because of ineligibility and the attitude of accepted students toward SEEK. The remaining questions were asked of all agencies and were concerned with community awareness and attitude toward SEEK, agency satisfaction with SEEK, and other areas.

FINDINGS

A. Disposition of Sample

Duplications and incorrect addresses, discovered after the original mailing, reduced the number of potential responding agencies from 1,222 to 1,175. Twenty-three percent (N=276) of these agencies completed and returned the questionnaire within the specified time limit (Table 1). Another 7% (N=77) wrote or called to explain that they would not be able to participate in the survey, usually because they had had no experience with SEEK or had insufficient records and did not feel qualified to respond (Table 2).

A sizeable majority (822, or 70%) of the agencies contacted did not respond at all to the survey, possibly because of a lack of experience with SEEK. In addition, some agencies had undergone a change of staff or had been discontinued and could not respond.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF AGENCIES RESPONDING

	N	%
Completed questionnaire	276	23%
Did not complete questionnaire	899	77
Responded with an explanation	77	7
No response at all	822	70
TOTAL	1,175	100%

NOTE: Unless otherwise specified, the numbers on the tables (i.e., the figures in columns headed "N") refer to the number of agencies, rather than the number of applicants or communities. Percentages are based on the total number of agencies responding to a given question; agencies which did not answer the question are omitted. Percentages may not add to 100% because of rounding, or because multiple responses are included in some tables.

TABLE 2

REASONS FOR NOT COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

	N	%
No involvement/experience with SEEK	25	32%
Change of staff/insufficient records prevent reply; do not know enough to reply	16	21
Questionnaire should be completed by main office or local offices	12	16
Locale or community served does not provide possible SEEK applicants	7	9
Have not referred directly to SEEK	5	6
Agency or unit discontinued	4	5
Miscellaneous or unknown reasons	8	10
TOTAL	77	99%

B. Referring vs. Non-Referring Agencies

Sixty-five percent (N=179) of the agencies completing the questionnaire indicated that they had made referrals to SEEK (Table 3). Although the remaining 35% said that they had made no referrals, this proportion is an underestimate because the majority of the 77 agencies which replied that they would not complete the questionnaire also reported a lack of contact with the program. In addition, information from another source suggests that a great many of the 822 agencies which did not respond at all had little contact with SEEK and made no referrals. Out of all the agencies that might have referred to SEEK, only 92 referred students who enrolled in Fall 1967 and only 235 referred students who enrolled in Spring 1968. Many applicants who are referred to SEEK do not enroll[1], which means that there may be many more agencies making referrals than the 92 or 235 whose referrals enrolled. It is not known, however, how many such agencies there were. Nevertheless, it seems likely that many of these agencies have never referred anyone to SEEK, and it is fairly certain that the number of "inactive" agencies is probably several hundred.

---

[1]Some are not eligible, some cannot be accommodated because of lack of space, and others are accepted but choose not to enroll.

TABLE 3

NUMBER OF AGENCIES REFERRING TO SEEK

	N	%
Have referred to SEEK	179	65%
Have never referred to SEEK	97	35
Agencies completing questionnaire	276	100%

Because of these findings, it is impossible to determine what proportion of the 1,175 agencies have made referrals to SEEK and what proportion have not, despite the preponderance of the former in the sample. For this reason, the presentation which follows will not combine the findings for referring and non-referring agencies, but will instead give the sample data for each type separately.

C. Activities and Experiences of Referring Agencies

The purpose of this section is to document some of the activities and experiences that "active" agencies -- those which referred applicants to SEEK -- have had with the program. For example:

When did they start referring?

How many applicants did each agency refer?

Do the agencies expect to increase their referrals in the future?

Whose idea is it to apply -- the applicant's or the agency's?

Have most applicants been out of high school for some time?

How many people want to apply but are ineligible?

Year Agency Began Referring to SEEK. Forty-two percent of the agencies which had made referrals began doing so in 1966, the year that SEEK began, while 35% began in 1967 and 23% began in 1968 (Table 4). Apparently, many of the agencies serving communities that would benefit from the SEEK program participated in SEEK from the very beginning.

Volume of Referrals. The number of applicants that the agencies referred to SEEK ranged from 1 to over 1,200, with an average of 35 applicants per agency. In spite of this relatively high average, 57% of the agencies each referred

TABLE 4

YEAR AGENCY BEGAN MAKING REFERRALS TO SEEK

	N	%
1966	76	42%
1967	62	35
1968	41	23
TOTAL	179	100%

only 10 or fewer applicants (Table 5). This was related to the year the agency began referring: the percentage of agencies referring 10 or fewer students varied from 36% of those which began referring in 1966 to 91% of the agencies which referred for the first time in 1968. Stated another way, more of the agencies which began referrals in 1966 referred larger numbers of students than agencies which began referrals at a later date.

Volume of Acceptances. The small number of referrals per agency is also reflected in the volume of acceptances: almost 7 out of 10 agencies reported 10 or fewer applicants who were accepted into the program (Table 6). The average number of applicants accepted per agency (omitting agencies which did not know how many were accepted) was 10. Interestingly, 18% of the agencies did not know how many of their applicants had been accepted.

For each of the 136 agencies that reported the number of applicants referred and the number of applicants accepted, an acceptance rate was computed by dividing the number accepted by the number referred. In two out of three of these agencies most referrals were not accepted, i.e., the acceptance rates were 50% or less (Table 7). This agrees with acceptance statistics for the program, that is, most

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF APPLICANTS REFERRED TO SEEK
BY YEAR AGENCY BEGAN REFERRING

Number of Applicants Per Agency	Total		1966		1967		1968	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	65	36%	17	22%	23	37%	25	61%
6 - 10	38	21	12	16	14	23	12	30
11 - 15	22	12	12	16	9	14	1	2
16 - 25	7	4	2	3	4	7	1	2
26 - 75	20	11	11	14	9	14	0	-
76 or more	17	9	14	19	2	3	1	2
Don't know	10	6	8	10	1	2	1	2
TOTAL	179	99%	76	100%	62	100%	41	99%

NOTE: The average number of applicants referred per agency was 35.

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF APPLICANTS PER AGENCY ACCEPTED IN SEEK

Number of Applicants Accepted Per Agency	N	%
None	14	8%
1 - 5	84	47
6 - 10	23	13
11 - 15	9	5
16 - 25	4	2
26 - 75	8	4
76 or more	4	3
Don't know	33	18
TOTAL	179	100%

NOTE: The average number of applicants accepted per agency was 10.

TABLE 7

ACCEPTANCE RATE PER AGENCY

(PERCENT OF REFERRALS ACCEPTED)

	N	%
10% or less	3	2
11 - 20%	17	12
21 - 30%	17	12
31 - 40%	27	20
41 - 50%	25	18
51 - 60%	18	13
61 - 70%	6	5
71 - 80%	7	5
81 - 90%	3	2
91 - 100%	14	10
TOTAL	137	99%

applicants are not accepted, primarily because the volume of applicants is considerably greater than the availability of openings. A large group of agencies (38%) had acceptance rates of one-third to one-half. About one out of four had less than one-third of their referrals accepted but at the other end of the scale were a few agencies reporting over 90% acceptances.

Trends in Volume of Referrals 1966-68. Agencies which referred to SEEK were asked if they referred more, the same, or fewer applicants in 1968 than in previous years, and if they expected to refer more, the same number, or fewer applicants in 1969. Only 3 out of 10 agencies which began referring to SEEK in 1966 and 1967 stated that they referred more applicants in 1968 than in previous years (Table 8). Another 3 out of 10 referred the same number, but 4 out of 10 referred fewer applicants. Whether an agency referred more or less in 1968 than previously, however, is related to the year the agency began making referrals to SEEK. Agencies which began referring in 1966 tended to refer fewer applicants than in previous years. On the other hand, agencies which began with SEEK in 1967 tended to refer more applicants in 1968 than previously.

TABLE 8

VOLUME OF REFERRALS DURING 1968, COMPARED WITH PREVIOUS YEARS, BY YEAR AGENCY BEGAN REFERRING TO SEEK[a]

	Total		1966		1967	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
More applicants in 1968	41	31%	15	21%	26	43%
Same number of applicants in 1968	41	31	22	31	19	31
Fewer applicants in 1968	50	38	34	48	16	26
TOTAL	132	100%	71	100%	61	100%

[a]Does not include agencies which began making referrals in 1968.

Expected Volume of Referrals in 1969. In contrast to the 1968 referral volume, 6 out of 10 agencies expected at the time of the survey to refer more applicants in 1969 than they did in 1968 (Table 9). This apparent upsurge in interest in participation in SEEK may be due to the increased activism and self-concern among minority groups. Receipt of the questionnaire may have caused some agencies to feel obliged to state that they would increase referrals. In addition, the SEEK program was in the news because of SEEK student activities at Queens College during the period when the questionnaires were mailed. Therefore, agencies were perhaps more aware of SEEK than previously.

Interest in College Among Potential Applicants. The projected increase in the number of applicants for the 1969 class may also be based on an increased interest among students in applying to SEEK. Virtually all (96%) referring agencies felt that there was "more" or "much more" interest now than in the past in going to college among the kind of students SEEK is trying to reach, i.e., young people living in poverty areas, usually from minority groups (Table 10). This heightened interest was also reported by the overwhelming majority (87%) of agencies which had never referred anyone to SEEK. It is

TABLE 9

EXPECTED VOLUME OF REFERRALS PER AGENCY
DURING 1969 COMPARED WITH 1968

	N	%
More applicants in 1969	105	61%
Same number of applicants in 1969	55	32
Fewer applicants in 1969	13	8
TOTAL	173	101%

TABLE 10

INTEREST IN GOING TO COLLEGE TODAY
COMPARED TO A FEW YEARS AGO

	Referring Agencies		Non-Referring Agencies	
	N	%	N	%
Increased interest	169	96%	75	87%
Much more interest	107	61	31	36
More interest	62	35	44	51
About the same interest	6	3	10	12
Decreased interest	1	1	1	1
Less interest	1	1	1	1
Much less interest	0	-	0	-
TOTAL	176	100%	86	100%

probably explained by the same reasons which account for the increased volume of referrals expected by referring agencies in 1969.

Initiation of Idea of Applying to SEEK. Each referring agency was asked how often applicants themselves initiated the idea of applying to SEEK and how often the agency initiated the idea. The agency initiated the idea of applying to SEEK more frequently than the applicants (Table 11). Only one-fourth of the agencies said that the applicants initiated the idea "always" or "most of the time." On the other hand, two-thirds of the agencies reported that they introduced the idea of applying "always" or "most of the time." Since there is a considerable lack of awareness of SEEK in communities served by the referring agencies (40% reported their communities to be "hardly" or "not at all" aware of SEEK), it is not surprising that the applicants suggested SEEK as a means of attending college less frequently than did the agencies.

Number of Years Out of High School Among Applicants. Agencies which had referred applicants were asked what percentage of their applicants had been out of high school for various periods of time. Over half the agencies reported that more

TABLE 11

INITIATION OF IDEA OF APPLYING TO SEEK

Applicants initiate idea	N	%
Always	9	5%
Most of the time	38	21
Some of the time	66	37
Not very often	43	24
Never	21	12
TOTAL	177	99%

Agency initiates idea	N	%
Always	42	24%
Most of the time	75	42
Some of the time	54	31
Not very often	4	2
Never	2	1
TOTAL	177	100%

than 50% of the applicants referred were either high school seniors (47%) or had been out of high school for less than one year (6%) (Table 12). Originally, SEEK had intended to reach potential students who had been out of high school for several years. Community agencies were enlisted to help select candidates since it was assumed that they would have more contact with older applicants than would high schools. Yet the responses to this question indicated that nearly half of the agencies had referred high school seniors, plus a few that referred applicants who were out of high school less than a year, rather than the older applicants they were originally intended to reach. Only one out of four agencies reported that most of their referrals were out of high school more than a year.

Interest in SEEK According to Time Out of High School. The greater volume of referrals among high school seniors and recent graduates may be due in part to a greater interest in SEEK reported for these applicants. Six out of ten referring agencies felt that seniors and recent graduates had more interest in applying to SEEK than students who had been out of school for several years (Table 13). This may well be a normal phenomenon, in that the greatest interest in

TABLE 12

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION STATUS OF 51% OR MORE OF APPLICANTS REFERRED BY EACH AGENCY

	N	%
High school seniors	77	47%
Out of high school less than 1 year	10	6
Out of high school more than 1 year but less than 5 years	32	19
Out of high school more than 5 years	8	5
Not in any one category[a]	38	23
TOTAL	165	100%

[a]Applicants referred by these agencies were in several categories of high school graduation status, no one of which contained 51% or more of the applicants.

TABLE 13

INTEREST IN APPLYING TO SEEK AMONG HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS AND RECENT HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES COMPARED TO GRADUATES WHO HAVE BEEN OUT OF SCHOOL FOR SEVERAL YEARS

High School Seniors and Recent Graduates have:	N	%
More interest	100	61%
Much more interest	64	39
More interest	36	22
Same interest	30	18
Less interest	33	20
Less interest	28	17
Much less interest	5	3
TOTAL	163	99%

college is found at the time of high school graduation. Nevertheless, a substantial proportion of agencies (four out of ten) reported that graduates out of high school for several years had the same or more interest in SEEK than did high school seniors or recent graduates.

Volume of Non-Referrals Because of Ineligibility. Several criteria have been established as requirements for eligibility in the SEEK program. Agencies that had referred students were asked for the approximate number of potential applicants they had discouraged from applying because they had not met one of four listed requirements. This information also serves as an indicator of interest in SEEK that does not come to the attention of the administration because no applications are filed for these cases.

The largest group of potential applicants (1,366) was ineligible because of previous college (Table 14). More than half of the agencies had discouraged applicants for this reason. Over 1,000 applicants were ineligible because they were over 30 years of age; 42% of the agencies reported discouraging potential students for this reason.[2] Nearly

---

2 These findings are supported by the fact that among SEEK applicants for Fall 1969, the most frequent reason for ineligibility was previous college, with over-age being the next most frequent reason.

TABLE 14

POTENTIAL APPLICANTS DISCOURAGED BY AGENCIES FROM APPLYING BECAUSE OF INELIGIBILITY

Reason for Ineligibility	Number of Applicants Discouraged	Number of Agencies Reporting	%[a]
Previously attended college	1,366	96	54%
Over 30 years of age	1,114	76	42
Not a NYC resident for at least one year	206	34	19
Not a U.S. citizen	131	30	17

[a]Base is 179 referring agencies.

350 potential students could not apply either because they were not U.S. citizens or had not been a New York City resident for at least one year.

D. Attitude Toward SEEK

In planning the survey it was felt that community agencies could provide information not only about their own activities and feelings concerning SEEK, but also about the communities they serve and the applicants with whom they deal. One of the major purposes of the study was to obtain information on attitudes toward SEEK. Were the agencies satisfied with it? How did their communities feel? How did the students react? These and related questions are the concern of the present section.

Student Discussion with Agency about SEEK Experiences. Referring agencies were asked about the extent to which students whom they referred to SEEK returned to the agencies and discussed their experiences in the program. About three-quarters of the referring agencies reported that at least some of the students they referred to SEEK later returned to discuss their experiences in the program (Table 15). Only 13% of the agencies reported that no students discussed their experiences, and about the same percentage reported that very few did. Apparently, agencies maintained a continuing involvement with the students which went beyond merely referring them to SEEK; it extended to an interest in their progress in college as well. It seems unlikely that such

TABLE 15

PROPORTION OF STUDENTS REFERRED BY AGENCY WHO DISCUSSED THEIR EXPERIENCES WITH AGENCY

	N	%
All students	45	26%
Most students	42	24
Some students	41	23
Very few students	25	14
No students	22	13
TOTAL	175	100%

a high percentage of students would have returned to the agencies if the latter had not communicated an interest in the students' careers in college. This high proportion gives added credence to the agencies' reports on student satisfaction.

Student Satisfaction with SEEK. Referring agencies were asked how satisfied the students were with SEEK. A great majority (72%) of the agencies reported that students were "completely" or "mostly" satisfied with SEEK (Table 16). Only 11% of the agencies felt that students were dissatisfied, while 17% thought that they were "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied."

Agency Satisfaction with SEEK The agencies were asked to indicate their own degree of satisfaction with SEEK. The most salient finding was that seven out of ten referring agencies were "completely" or "mostly" satisfied with SEEK (Table 17). Only eight percent were "mostly" or "completely" dissatisfied, while the remainder were "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied."

TABLE 16

STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH SEEK

	N	%
Completely satisfied	21	13%
Mostly satisfied	93	59
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	26	17
Mostly dissatisfied	15	10
Completely dissatisfied	2	1
TOTAL	157	100%

TABLE 17

AGENCY SATISFACTION WITH SEEK

	Referring Agencies		Non-Referring Agencies	
	N	%	N	%
Completely satisfied	37	21%	8	10%
Mostly satisfied	87	50	18	23
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	36	21	51	64
Mostly dissatisfied	13	7	1	1
Completely dissatisfied	1	1	2	3
TOTAL	174	100%	80	101%

Agency Satisfaction and Student Satisfaction. Agency satisfaction with SEEK appears to reflect student satisfaction. Where students were felt to be satisfied with SEEK, 88% of the referring agencies reported that they themselves were satisfied, compared with 52% where students were seen as neutral, and only 8% among the few agencies reporting dissatisfied students (Table 18). Since information on student satisfaction was obtained from the agencies rather than from the students, the relationship of agency and student satisfaction might represent the agencies' projection of their own feelings about the program onto the students, or a response set, that is, a tendency by many agencies to answer all questions in a particular manner (e.g., favorably); on the other hand, the relationship could also be due to the feedback returning students give to the agencies when they visit. These factors also pertain to agency reports on community attitudes and community awareness of SEEK.

Community Attitude Toward SEEK. Agencies were asked about their communities' attitudes toward SEEK. Agencies which had made referrals reported predominantly favorable attitudes: two out of three of these agencies stated that

TABLE 18

AGENCY SATISFACTION BY STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH SEEK

	Student Satisfaction					
	Satisfied		Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied	
Agency Satisfaction	N	%	N	%	N	%
Satisfied	99	88%	15	52%	1	8%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	10	9	88	28	4	31
Dissatisfied	33	3	6	21	8	62
TOTAL	112	100%	29	101%	13	101%

their communities were "mostly" or "completely favorable" toward SEEK (Table 19). One out of three reported neutral attitudes ("neither favorable nor unfavorable") and only three percent found unfavorable attitudes.

Community Attitude and Student Satisfaction. Among referring agencies, perception of community attitudes varied directly with student satisfaction with SEEK (Table 20). The greater the degree of student satisfaction reported, the greater the perception of favorable community attitudes. For example, among agencies reporting students as being satisfied with SEEK, 74% reported favorable community attitudes, compared with 27% where students were considered dissatisfied. Student satisfaction seems to be an important factor in the agencies' own satisfaction with SEEK and in their perception of community attitudes toward the program.

Community Awareness of SEEK. In most cases, agencies which made referrals to SEEK reported a general awareness of SEEK in their communities, yet a substantial proportion found little or no awareness: 60% believed their communities to be "very" or "somewhat" aware, but 40% found them to be "hardly" or "not at all" aware (Table 21).

TABLE 19

AGENCY PERCEPTION OF COMMUNITY
ATTITUDE TOWARD SEEK

	Referring Agencies		Non-Referring Agencies	
	N	%	N	%
Completely favorable	39	23%	11	13%
Mostly favorable	70	41	26	32
Neither favorable nor unfavorable	56	33	42	51
Mostly unfavorable	3	2	3	4
Completely unfavorable	1	1	-	-
TOTAL	169	100%	82	100%

TABLE 20

COMMUNITY ATTITUDE BY STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH SEEK

	Student Satisfaction					
	Satisfied		Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied	
Community Attitude	N	%	N	%	N	%
Favorable	82	74%	11	50%	4	27%
Neither favorable nor unfavorable	28	25	10	45	9	60
Unfavorable	1	1	1	5	2	13
TOTAL	111	100%	22	100%	15	100%

TABLE 21

AGENCY PERCEPTION OF COMMUNITY AWARENESS OF SEEK

	Referring Agencies		Non-Referring Agencies	
Community Awareness	N	%	N	%
Very aware	29	16%	6	7%
Somewhat aware	77	44	31	34
Hardly aware	60	34	38	42
Not at all aware	11	6	16	18
TOTAL	177	100%	91	101%

Attitudes Reported by Non-Referring Agencies. Attitudinal information given by the non-referring agencies should be interpreted with caution because of the relative lack of contact between these agencies and the program. The information these agencies gave, however, does reflect this lack of contact, although many held opinions on the program and claimed to perceive some degree of community awareness as well as community feeling about SEEK. More than six out of ten non-referring agencies, for example, were "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied", but fully one out of three expressed satisfaction with the program (Table 17). Six out of ten reported a lack of community awareness of SEEK, yet a substantial proportion (41%) believed their communities to be "very" or "somewhat" aware of the program (Table 21). About half reported neutral community feeling toward SEEK, but nearly as many perceived favorable community attitudes (Table 19). The substantial proportion of "satisfied" agencies and agencies reporting "aware" communities and communities favorable to the program might represent agency bias in favor of SEEK; to the extent that these agencies' responses were realistic, however, they indicate positive agency and community feeling for the program despite the absence of direct contact with the program.

E. Selected Characteristics of Agencies

A limited amount of information was obtained about the types of agencies included in the survey. The agencies were asked about their major functions, their sources of funds, and about other programs to which they refer students.

Major Functions. The agencies responding to the questionnaire served a wide range of community needs. Although most agencies performed more than one service in the community, each agency was classified into one category that seemed to represent its major function (Table 22). The variety of functions was so broad that 13 categories were required, including a "Miscellaneous" class.

The major functions of the referring agencies, in order of frequency, were community service (16%), employment-vocational (16%), religious (11%), and family service (9%). Educational and "multi-service" agencies were somewhat less represented, while the types least represented dealt with delinquency, health, mental health, housing and "coordinating." The most common types of non-referring agencies were recreational, religious, family service, multi-service and educational.

TABLE 22

MAJOR FUNCTION OF AGENCY

	Referring Agencies		Non-Referring Agencies	
	N	%	N	%
Community service/action	26	16%	9	10%
Religious	18	11	16	17
Recreation/neighborhood centers	10	6	19	20
Employment/vocational	25	16	3	3
Family service/casework	14	9	13	14
Education	13	8	11	12
Multi-service	12	8	12	13
Work with juvenille delinquents	8	5	2	2
Hospital/health	8	5	-	-
Psychiatric/mental health	7	4	-	-
Housing	7	4	-	-
Coordinating agency	2	1	3	3
Miscellaneous (e.g., Fire Department, civil rights, care for the aged)	9	6	5	5
TOTAL	159	99%	93	99%

Sources of Funding. Most of the agencies were funded by more than one source, but the proportion of income from each source was not obtained. The government was the major source of funds for the referring agencies: almost seven out of ten agencies received funds from at least one governmental source - either city, federal, or state (Table 23). About 40% of these agencies received money from private sources. On the other hand, the major source of funds for the non-referring agencies was private funds (57%), but nearly as many received government funds (53%).

Referrals to Other Programs. There are college programs similar to SEEK but outside of The City University system. To how many of these programs do the agencies refer students? A majority of the referring agencies sent students to only "a few other programs" or to "no other programs"; nearly four out of ten referred students only to SEEK (Table 24). Referrals to other college programs were even less common among non-referring agencies, most of which did not refer students to any programs. Where agencies did make other referrals, a wide variety of programs were named. A partial listing of these may be found in Appendix D.

TABLE 23

SOURCE OF AGENCY FUNDS[a]

	Referring Agencies		Non-Referring Agencies	
	N	%	N	%
Government Funds	118	70%	54	55%
City	72	43	40	41
Federal	71	42	33	34
State	37	22	23	23
Private Funds	73	43	58	59
Other Sources	22	13	21	21
TOTAL	168		98	

[a]Multiple responses possible, i.e., some agencies received funds from more than one source.

TABLE 24

NUMBER OF OTHER COLLEGE PROGRAMS
TO WHICH AGENCIES REFER STUDENTS

	Agencies Referring to SEEK		Agencies Not Referring to SEEK	
	N	%	N	%
Many other programs	12	7%	2	2%
Several other programs	27	16	5	6
A few other programs	71	41	29	35
No other programs	62	36	46	56
TOTAL	172	100%	82	99%

In addition, agencies were asked if they referred individuals to Urban Centers,[3] or to skills or technical programs. Eight out of ten referring agencies had referred individuals to Urban Centers and the same proportion had referred students to skills or technical programs (Table 25). These proportions were considerably lower among non-referring agencies. Agencies which refer to SEEK are more likely to refer to other programs than are agencies which do not refer to SEEK.

---

[3]Urban Centers provide career-oriented training to high school graduates who seek specific job skills, and a college adapter course.

TABLE 25

AGENCY REFERRALS TO URBAN CENTERS
AND SKILLS OR TECHNICAL PROGRAMS

	Agencies Referring to SEEK		Agencies Not Referring to SEEK	
Urban Centers	N	%	N	%
Agency made referrals	105	80%	25	42%
Agency did not make referrals	27	20	34	58
TOTAL	132	100%	59	100%
Skills or Technical Programs				
Agency made referrals	123	84%	50	63%
Agency did not make referrals	23	16	29	37
TOTAL	146	100%	79	100%

F. Recommended Changes for SEEK

All agencies were asked to note the changes, if any, that they thought should be made in the SEEK Program. The most frequent suggestion was for more publicity and communication with communities and agencies about SEEK - its goals, purposes, and eligibility criteria (Table 26). A greater percentage (66%) of the non-referring agencies gave this suggestion. Probably because they had less contact with SEEK, non-referring agencies felt a greater need for information.

Feedback from SEEK on the rejection or acceptance of referred students was suggested by 15% of the referring agencies. Revisions in eligibility criteria were also suggested: 19% of the referring agencies thought that SEEK should accept older students (students over thirty years of age), 16% felt that students with previous college experience should be accepted, and 10% thought that the poverty area requirement should be dropped or changed.

Few of the non-referring agencies suggested changes, most of these agencies felt that their lack of experience with the program prevented them from commenting. The only frequently mentioned change in addition to more publicity on SEEK that non-referring agencies suggested was for an expansion of SEEK to admit more students.

TABLE 26

CHANGES SUGGESTED FOR SEEK PROGRAM

	Referring Agencies		Non-Referring Agencies	
	N	%	N	%
More publicity/communication with community and agency on SEEK purposes, eligibility criteria	23	19%	21	66%
Accept older/over 30 students	23	19	2	6
Accept students with previous college experience	19	16	1	3
Feedback from SEEK to agencies on students referred or accepted	18	15	-	-
Expand SEEK; accept more students	14	12	6	19
Shorter period between application and notification of acceptance or rejection	13	11	-	-
Change poverty area requirement	12	10	2	6
SEEK should work more closely/ have more contact with community agencies	8	7	3	9
Additional financial aid; increase the stipend	7	6	-	-
More black and Puerto Rican Counselors, teachers, administrators	5	4	-	-
Better feedback/communication from SEEK to students on applications	3	3	-	-
More involvement with the community or students' families	2	2	1	3
Suggest other programs for those who are not accepted into SEEK	2	2	-	-
TOTAL[a]	120		32	

[a]Percentages are based on the total number ansering the question (120 referring and 32 non-referring agencies). Multiple responses are possible.

COMMUNITY AGENCY EXPERIENCE SURVEY

Please DO NOT WRITE HERE 1/ 2/ 3/ 4/ 5/ 6/

1. Has your agency ever referred any individuals to SEEK?

   Yes /__/ 1

   No /__/ 2 (IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 14) 7/

2. When did your agency start referring individuals to SEEK?

   (Check only one)

   1966 /__/ 1

   1967 /__/ 2 8/

   1968 /__/ 3

3. Approximately how many applicants has your agency referred to SEEK? 9/ 10/ 11/ 12/

   _____

4. Approximately how many of the applicants whom your agency referred were accepted? 13/ 14/ 15/ 16/

   _____

5. During 1968 did your agency refer: (Check only one)

   More applicants than in previous years /__/ 1

   About the same number of applicants as in previous years . . . . . /__/ 2 17/

   Fewer applicants than in previous years /__/ 3

6. During 1969 does your agency expect to refer:

	(check only one)		
More applicants than in 1968	/__/	1	
About the same number of applicants as in 1968	/__/	2	18/
Fewer applicants than in 1968	/__/	3	

7. Approximately what per cent of the applicants referred by your agency:

(Total should equal 100%)

		19/
a. Were high school seniors	_____ %	20/
b. Were out of high school for less than a year.	_____ %	21/ 22/
c. Were out of high school for more than one year, but less than five years. . . .	_____ %	23/ 24/
d. Were out of high school for five years or more.	_____ %	25/ 26/
Total =	100 %	

8. How would you compare the interest in applying to SEEK of high school seniors and recent graduates with the interest of students who have been out of high school for several years?

High school seniors and recent graduates have:

	(check only one)		
Much more interest in applying to SEEK	/__/	1	
More interest in applying to SEEK	/__/	2	
Same interest in applying to SEEK	/__/	3	27/
Less interest in applying to SEEK	/__/	4	
Much less interest in applying to SEEK	/__/	5	

9. How often do the applicants themselves initiate the idea of applying to SEEK?

(circle one choice)

1	2	3	4	5	
Always	Most of the time	Some of the time	Not very often	Never	28/

10. How often does your agency initiate the idea of applying to SEEK?

(circle one choice)

1	2	3	4	5	
Always	Most of the time	Some of the time	Not very often	Never	29/

11. How many SEEK students who were referred by your agency later discussed their experiences with you?

(circle one choice)

1	2	3	4	5	
All	Most	Some	Very few	None	30/

12. In general, how satisfied were these students with SEEK?

(circle one choice)

1	2	3	4	5	
Completely satisfied	Mostly satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Mostly dissatisfied	Completely dissatisfied	31/

13. As you know, applicants for SEEK must meet certain eligibility criteria. For each of the eligibility requirements listed below, indicate the approximate number of potential applicants whom you had to discourage from applying because they could not meet the particular requirement.

Indicate Number Discouraged

32/

a. Individuals over 30 years of age _____ 33/
34/

b. Individuals who had previously attended college _____ 35/
36/
37/

c. Individuals who were not citizens, and did not have a Declaration of Intention . . . . . _____ 38/
39/
40/

d. Individuals who had not resided in New York City for at least one year . . . . . _____ 41/
42/
43/

14. How aware of SEEK is the community that you deal with?

(circle one choice)

1	2	3	4	
Very aware	Somewhat aware	Hardly aware	Not aware at all	44/

15. What is your community's attitude toward SEEK?

(circle one choice)

1	2	3	4	5	
Completely favorable	Mostly favorable	Neither favorable nor unfavorable	Mostly unfavorable	Completely unfavorable	45/

16. How satisfied is your agency with SEEK?

(circle one choice)

1	2	3	4	5	
Completely satisfied	Mostly satisfied	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	Mostly dissatisfied	Completely dissatisfied	46/

17. Among the kind of students SEEK is trying to reach do you think that there is more interest in going to college today than there was a few years ago?

(circle on choice)

1	2	3	4	5	
Much more interest	More interest	About the same interest	Less interest	Much less interest	47/

18. To how many college programs similar to SEEK outside of the City University does your agency refer students?

(check only one)

Many other programs	/__/	1	
Several other programs	/__/	2	48/
A few other programs.	/__/	3	
No other programs	/__/	4	

(If applicable) To which other college programs does your agency refer students for college? _____

_____

19. Does your agency recommend any individuals to:

			(circle only one)				
1. Urban Centers	Yes	/__/	1	No	/__/	2	49/
2. Skills or technical programs	Yes	/__/	1	No	/__/	2	50/
3. Others (please specify)			_____				51/
			_____				
			_____				

20. What changes, if any, do you think should be made in the SEEK Program? 52/

(IF NECESSARY, CONTINUE ON THE BACK OF THIS PAGE)

Name of agency _____

Address of agency _____

_____

NAME OF DIRECTOR OF AGENCY _____

HOW IS YOUR AGENCY FUNDED? (check as many as apply)

City Funds . . . . . /__/ 1

State Funds. . . . . /__/ 2

Federal Funds. . . . . /__/ 3

Private Funds. . . . . /__/ 4

Others . . . . . /__/ 5

IF OTHERS, please explain _____

_____

_____

_____

YOUR NAME _____

_____

YOUR TITLE _____

TODAY'S DATE _____

MAJOR FUNCTIONS OF AGENCY _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B. Covering Letter

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
SEEK PROGRAM
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION UNIT
23 LEXINGTON AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10010

Tel.: 677-2920

February, 1969

The SEEK Program of The City University of New York is now in its third year and is greatly indebted to community groups for helping to make this innovative program in higher education more successful than it might have been. However, we are always striving to improve the program and therefore still need your cooperation in providing better service to the students.

As a result we would like to ask your further cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaire. Your frank opinion is called for and will be greatly appreciated by all of us affiliated with the program.

May we have your reply by February 17.

Sincerely yours,

Leslie Berger

Leslie Berger, Ph.D.
Director of SEEK

cc: Rachel D. Wilkinson, Ph.D.
Director of Community Relations
Angelo Dispenzieri, Ph.D.
Director of Research

Appendix C. Reminder Letter

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK
SEEK PROGRAM
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION UNIT
23 LEXINGTON AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10010

Tel.: 677-2920

February 20, 1968

Dear Sir:

Several weeks ago we sent you a questionnaire concerning your agency's experiences with the SEEK Program. We have not yet received any reply from you. For our study to be meaningful, it is very important that all the questionnaires are returned.

Please complete the questionnaire and return it to us within the next day or two.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Leslie Berger

Leslie Berger, Ph.D.
Director of SEEK

P.S. Please ignore this letter if you have already returned the questionnaire.

Appendix D. Other Educational Programs To Which Agencies Refer Students

Upward Bound
Aspira
Manpower Career Development
College Discovery
Job Corps
NOAH
ABC
Urban Center
Colleges, private, out-of State
NYU, Columbia, Harvard, Yale, Bowdoin, State Colleges of N.Y., Fordham, Reed, Wilberforce, Marymount, Bethany College, Jarvis Christian College, Howard, Tugaloo, and others.
HARCAP
Harlem Prep
Neighborhood Youth Corps
Women's Talent Corps
Sponsors for Educational Opportunity
Apprenticeship Programs
On-the-Job Training Programs.